Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed March

18, 2008.

I. <u>Summary of Examiner's Objections/Rejections</u>

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 10-13, 16-18, and 25-27.

II. Summary of Applicant's Response

This Reply amends claim 1, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1, 10-

13, 16-18, and 25-27. The claims were amended to better describe embodiments of Applicant's

invention. Reconsideration of the claims is requested.

III. Response to 35 U.S.C. 112 Rejection

Claim 1 was amended to better describe embodiments of Applicant's invention. Applicant

respectfully submits that Claim 1 even more fully satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112.

IV. Response to 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 103(a) Rejections to Claims 1-3, 10, 12, 16-18, and 27

Claim 1

Claim 1 (as amended) states:

A computer program product including a storage medium with instructions

thereon for execution by a computer for high level dynamic code generation, the

instructions comprising:

a) computer code for <u>automatically</u> creating a class file container object that

- 5 -

stores source code describing a class, wherein creating a class file container object

includes selecting a class name and a super class for the class;

b) computer code for adding a first source code defining a method to the class

stored in the class file container object;

c) computer code for adding a second source code into the method in the class

stored in the class file container object;

d) computer code for repeating instructions b and c to populate the class stored

in the class file container object;

e) computer code for generating a tree of statements and expressions based on

the class stored in the class file container object;

f) computer code for using the tree of statements and expressions to generate

byte code for the class; and

g) computer code for instantiating an instance of the class;

wherein the computer program product can generate code for any type of Java<sup>TM</sup>

program.

Claim 1 defines a computer program product including a storage medium with instructions

thereon for execution by a computer for high level dynamic code generation. The instructions

comprise: computer code for automatically creating a class file container object that stores source

code describing a class, wherein creating a class file container object includes selecting a class name

and a super class for the class, computer code for adding a first source code defining a method to the

class stored in the class file container object, computer code for adding a second source code into the

method in the class stored in the class file container object, computer code for repeating the previous

- 6 -

two instructions to populate the class stored in the class file container object, computer code for

generating a tree of statements and expressions based on the class stored in the class file container

object, computer code for using the tree of statements and expressions to generate byte code for the

class, and computer code for instantiating an instance of the class, wherein the computer program

product can dynamically generate code.

Claim 1 was rejected under 102(b) based on Bentley (U.S. Patent No. 5,815,415). Bentley,

col. 11, lines 15-19, describes "an object-oriented schema implementation programming language."

Claim 1 requires "a) computer code for <u>automatically</u> creating a class file container object

that stores source code describing a class, wherein creating a class file container object includes

selecting a class name and a super class for the class." Bentley describes an object-oriented

programming language. While Bentley describes a programming language that a programmer could

use to create a class, Bentley does not disclose Claim 1 which requires "computer code for

automatically creating a class file container object." Furthermore, Bentley's object oriented

programming language does not disclose dynamic code generation.

Applicant respectfully submits that the embodiment as defined in Independent Claim 1 is not

anticipated by Bentley. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection to

claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 10-12, 16-18, and 25-27

Dependent Claims 10-12, 16-18, and 25-27 depend from Claim 1. For at least the reasons

discussed above, Dependent Claims 10-12, 16-18, and 25-27 are patentable. Dependent Claims 10-

12, 16-18, and 25-27 add their own features which render them patentable in their own right.

- 7 -

V. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the

subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration is requested. The Examiner is

respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting

issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to

Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for

extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 18, 2008

By: /Thomas K. Plunkett/

Thomas K. Plunkett Reg. No. 57,253

Customer No. 23910

FLIESLER MEYER LLP 650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Francisco, California 94108

Telephone: (415) 362-3800 Facsimile: (415) 362-2928